

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 remain pending in the present application. Claims 5 and 7 have been amended. Claim 10 is new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Maruyama (JP 11127300). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection by the Examiner. Maruyama discloses a facsimile machine which is stationary and thus is not a mobile terminal. The facsimile machine of Maruyama includes a control section 1, an image recording section 2, an image processing section 3, an image read section 4 and an antenna 12. The facsimile machine performs a facsimile transmission/reception operation, a copy operation and a telephone operation including communicating with a cordless telephone. The facsimile machine communicates with the cordless telephone through a cordless connecting device 11 and the antenna 12. The facsimile machine is held stationary (positioned in an office or home) during its operation and thus it cannot be considered a mobile terminal as defined in Claim 1. The cordless telephone which it communicates with is a mobile terminal and not the facsimile machine which acts as a base unit for the cordless telephone. Furthermore, as clearly stated in paragraph [0046] of Maruyama the control section (control means) 1 of Maruyama performs a standby operation during a copy operation (i.e. an image capture operation) unlike Claim 1 which prohibits the standby operation during an image capture operation. The cordless telephone 13 (the mobile terminal) does not have the control means defined in Claim 1

that prohibits the standby operation during an image capture operation when a first predetermined condition is satisfied. The cordless telephone of Maruyama does not have an image processing operation which is a part of the control means defined in Claims 1 and 7. The image processing operation is at the facsimile machine which is a stationary base for the cordless telephone.

Thus, Applicants believe Claims 1 and 7 patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-6, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maruyama (JP 11127300). The above discussion of Maruyama applies here also. The mobile unit (cordless telephone) of Maruyama cannot possibly have a camera-dedicated mode since it does not have image capability.

Thus, Applicants believe Claim 8 patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 9, which depends from Claim 8, is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM

New Claim 10 is a dependent claim which Applicants believe properly further limits Claim 3 and is thus believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 10, 2004

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg